

Self-stabilizing Byzantine Agreement

Ariel Daliot and Danny Dolev*

School of Engineering and Computer Science

The Hebrew University, Jerusalem, Israel

Email: adaliot@gmail.com, danny.dolev@mail.huji.ac.il

August 2, 2009

Abstract

Byzantine agreement algorithms typically assume implicit initial state consistency and synchronization among the correct nodes and then operate in coordinated rounds of information exchange to reach agreement based on the input values. The implicit initial assumptions enable correct nodes to infer about the progression of the algorithm at other nodes from their local state. This paper considers a more severe fault model than permanent Byzantine failures, one in which the system can in addition be subject to severe transient failures that can temporarily throw the system out of its assumption boundaries. When the system eventually returns to behave according to the presumed assumptions it may be in an arbitrary state in which any synchronization among the nodes might be lost, and each node may be at an arbitrary state. We present a self-stabilizing Byzantine agreement algorithm that reaches agreement among the correct nodes in an optimal ratio of faulty to correct, by using only the assumption of eventually bounded message transmission delay. In the process of solving the problem, two additional important and challenging building blocks were developed: a unique self-stabilizing protocol for assigning consistent relative times to protocol initialization and a Reliable Broadcast primitive that progresses at the speed of actual message delivery time.

Categories and Subject Descriptors: C.2.4 [Distributed Systems]: Distributed applications;

General Terms: Algorithms, Reliability, Theory.

Keywords: Byzantine Agreement, Self-Stabilization, Byzantine Faults, Pulse Synchronization, Transient Failures, Reliable Broadcast.

1 Introduction

The Byzantine agreement (Byzantine Generals) problem was first introduced by Pease, Shostak and Lamport [13]. It is now considered as a fundamental problem in fault-tolerant distributed computing. The task is to reach agreement in a network of n nodes in which up-to f nodes may be faulty. A distinguished node (*the General or the initiator*) broadcasts a value m , following which all nodes exchange messages until the

*Supported in part by ISF.

non-faulty nodes agree upon the same value. If the initiator is non-faulty then all non-faulty nodes are required to agree on the same value that the initiator sent.

Standard deterministic Byzantine agreement algorithms operate in the synchronous network model in which it is assumed that all correct nodes initialize the agreement procedure (and any underlying primitives) at about the same time. By assuming concurrent initializations of the algorithm a synchronous rounds structure can be enforced and used to infer on the progression of the algorithm from the point of initialization. Moreover, there is always an implicit assumption about the consistency of the initial states of all correct nodes, or at least a quorum of them.

We consider a more severe fault-model in which in addition to the permanent presence of Byzantine failures, the system can also be subject to severe transient failures that can temporarily throw all the nodes and the communication subsystem out of the assumption boundaries. E.g. resulting in more than one third of the nodes being Byzantine or messages of non-faulty nodes getting lost or altered. This will render the whole system practically unworkable. Eventually the system must experience a tolerable level of permanent faults for a sufficiently long period of time. Otherwise it would remain unworkable forever. When the system eventually returns to behave according to the presumed assumptions, each node may be in an arbitrary state. It makes sense to require a system to resume operation after such a major failure without the need for an outside intervention to restart the whole system from scratch or to correct it.

Classic Byzantine algorithms cannot guarantee to execute from an arbitrary state, because they are not designed with self-stabilization in mind. They typically make use of assumptions on the initial state of the system such as assuming all clocks are initially synchronized or that the initial states are initialized consistently at all correct nodes (cf. from the very first polynomial solution [10] through many others like [14]). Conversely, A *self-stabilizing* protocol converges to its goal from any state once the system behaves well again, but is typically not resilient to the permanent presence of faults.

In trying to combine both fault models, Byzantine failures present a special challenge for designing self-stabilizing distributed algorithms due to the “ambition” of malicious nodes to incessantly hamper stabilization. This difficulty may be indicated by the remarkably few algorithms resilient to both fault models (see [4] for a review). The few published self-stabilizing Byzantine algorithms are typically complicated and sometimes converge from an arbitrary initial state only after exponential or super exponential time ([8]). Recently efficient solutions were presented for the strict synchronization model in which an outside entity provides repetitive synchronized timing events at all correct nodes at once ([9]).

In our model correct nodes cannot assume a common reference to time or even to any common anchor in time and they cannot assume that any procedure or primitive initialize concurrently. This is the result of the possible loss of synchronization following transient faults that might corrupt any agreement or coordination among the correct nodes and alter their internal states. Thus synchronization must be restored from an arbitrary state while facing on-going Byzantine failures. This is a very tricky task considering that all current tools for containing Byzantine failures, such as [2, 14], assume that synchronization already exists and are thus preempted for use. Our protocol achieves self-stabilizing Byzantine agreement without the assumption of any existing synchrony besides bounded message delivery. In [1] it is proven to be impossible to combine self-stabilization with even crash faults without the assumption of bounded message delivery.

Note that the problem is not relaxed even in the case of a one-shot agreement, i.e. in case that it is known that the General will initiate agreement only once throughout the life of the system. Even if the General is correct and even if agreement is initiated after the system has returned to its coherent

behavior following transient failures, then the correct nodes might hold corrupted variable values that might prevent the possibility to reach agreement. The nodes have no knowledge as to when the system returns to coherent behavior or when the General will initiate agreement and thus cannot target to reset their memory exactly at this critical time period. Recurrent agreement initialization by the General allows for recurrent reset of memory with the assumption that eventually all correct nodes reset their memory in a coherent state of the system and before the General initializes agreement. This introduces the problem of how nodes can know when to reset their memory in case of many ongoing concurrent invocations of the algorithm, such as in the case of a faulty General disseminating several values all the time. In such a case correct nodes might hold different sets of messages that were sent by other correct nodes as they might reset their memory at different times.

In our protocol, once the system complies with the theoretically required bound of $3f < n$ permanent Byzantine faulty nodes in a network of n nodes and messages are delivered within bounded time, following a period of transient failures, then regardless of the state of the system, the goal of Byzantine agreement is satisfied within $O(f')$ communication rounds (where $f' \leq f$ is the actual number of concurrent faults). The protocol can be executed in a one-shot mode by a single General or by recurrent agreement initializations and by different Generals. It tolerates transient failures and permanent Byzantine faults and makes no assumption on any initial synchronized activity among the nodes (such as having a common reference to time or a common event for triggering initialization).

For ease of following the arguments and proofs, the structure and logic of our `SS-BYZ-AGREE` procedure is modeled on that of [14]. The rounds in that protocol progress following elapsed time. Each round spans a constant predefined time interval. Our protocol, besides being self-stabilizing, has the additional advantage of having a message-driven rounds structure and not time-driven rounds structure. Thus the actual time for terminating the protocol depends on the actual communication network speed and not on the worst possible bound on message delivery time.

It is important to note that we have previously presented a distributed self-stabilizing Byzantine pulse synchronization procedure in [3]. It aims at delivering a common anchor in time to all correct nodes within a short time following transient failures and with the permanent presence of Byzantine nodes. We have also previously presented a protocol for making any Byzantine algorithm be self-stabilizing [5], assuming the existence of synchronized pulses. Byzantine agreement can easily be achieved using a pulse synchronization procedure: the pulse invocation can serve as the initialization event for round zero of the agreement protocol. Thus any existing Byzantine agreement protocol may be used, on top of the pulse synchronization procedure, to attain self-stabilizing Byzantine agreement. The current paper achieves Byzantine agreement without assuming synchronized pulses. Moreover, we show in [6] that synchronized pulses can actually be produced more efficiently atop the protocol in the current paper. This pulse synchronization procedure can in turn be used as the pulse synchronization mechanism for making any Byzantine algorithm self-stabilize, in a more efficient way and in a more general model than by using the pulse synchronization procedure in [3].

An early version of the results covered in the current paper appeared in [7]. The current paper provides elaborated proofs and correct some mistakes that appear in the early version.

In [15] it is shown how to initialize Byzantine clock synchronization without assuming a common initialization phase. It can eventually also execute synchronized Byzantine agreement by using the synchronized clocks. The solution is not self-stabilizing as nodes are booted and thus do not initialize with arbitrary

values in the memory.

In [11] consensus is reached assuming eventual synchrony. Following an unstable period with unbounded failures and message delays, eventually no node fails and messages are delivered within bounded, say d , time. At this point there is no synchrony among the correct nodes and they might hold copies of obsolete messages. This is seemingly similar to our model but the solution is not truly self-stabilizing since the nodes do not initialize with arbitrary values. Furthermore, the solution only tolerates stopping failures and no new nodes fail subsequent to stabilization. Consensus is reached within $O(d)$. That paper also argues that in their model, although with Byzantine failures, consensus cannot be reached within less than $O(f') \cdot d$ time, which is essentially identical to our time complexity. Our solution operates in a more severe fault model and thus converges in linear time.

2 Model and Problem Definition

The environment is a network of n nodes that communicate by exchanging messages. We assume that the message passing medium allows for an authenticated identity of the senders. The communication network does not guarantee any order on messages among different nodes, though, when the network is functioning correctly, any message sent will eventually be delivered. Individual nodes have no access to a central clock and there is no external pulse system. The hardware clock rate (referred to as the *physical timers*) at each non-faulty node has a bounded drift, ρ , from real-time rate. Ensuant to transient failures there can be an unbounded number of concurrent faulty nodes, the turnover rate between faulty and non-faulty nodes can be arbitrarily large and the communication network may behave arbitrarily.

Definition 1. *A node is non-faulty at times that it complies with the following:*

1. (Bounded Drift) *Obeys a global constant $0 < \rho < 1$ (typically $\rho \approx 10^{-6}$), such that for every real-time interval $[u, v]$:*

$$(1 - \rho)(v - u) \leq \text{'physical timer'}(v) - \text{'physical timer'}(u) \leq (1 + \rho)(v - u).$$

2. (Obedience) *Operates according to the instructed protocol.*
3. (Bounded Processing Time) *Processes any message of the instructed protocol within π real-time units of arrival time.*¹

A node is considered **faulty** if it violates any of the above conditions. A faulty node may recover from its Byzantine behavior once it resumes obeying the conditions of a non-faulty node. In order to keep the definitions consistent, the “correction” is not immediate but rather takes a certain amount of time during which the non-faulty node is still not counted as a correct node, although it supposedly behaves “correctly”.² We later specify the time-length of continuous non-faulty behavior required of a recovering node to be considered **correct**.

Definition 2. *The communication network is non-faulty at periods that it complies with the following:*

¹We assume that the bounds include also the overhead of the operating system in sending and processing of messages.

²For example, a node may recover with arbitrary variables, which may violate the validity condition if considered correct immediately.

1. Any message arrives at its destination node within δ real-time units;
2. The sender's identity and the content of any message being received is not tampered.

Thus, our communication network model is a “bounded-delay” communication network. We do not assume the existence of a broadcast medium. We assume that the network cannot store old messages for arbitrary long time or lose any more messages, once it becomes non-faulty.³

We use the notation $d \equiv (\delta + \pi) \times (1 + \rho)$. Thus, when the communication network is non-faulty, d is the upper bound on the elapsed time from the sending of a message by a non-faulty node until it is received and processed by every non-faulty node, as measured by the local clock at any non-faulty node.⁴

Note that n , f and d are fixed constants and thus non-faulty nodes do not initialize with arbitrary values of these constants.

A recovering node should be considered correct only once it has been continuously non-faulty for enough time to enable it to have deleted old or spurious messages and to have exchanged information with the other nodes.

Definition 3. *The communication network is **correct** following Δ_{net} real-time of continuous non-faulty behavior.*⁵

Definition 4. *A node is **correct** following Δ_{node} real-time of continuous non-faulty behavior during a period that the communication network is correct.*⁶

Definition 5. (System Coherence) *The system is said to be **coherent** at times that it complies with the following:*

- (Quorum) *There are at least $n - f$ correct nodes,*⁷ *where f is the upper bound on the number of potentially non-correct nodes at steady state.*

Hence, when the system is not coherent, there can be an unbounded number of concurrent faulty nodes; the turnover rate between the faulty and non-faulty nodes can be arbitrarily large and the communication network may deliver messages with unbounded delays, if at all. The system is considered coherent, once the communication network and a sufficient fraction of the nodes have been non-faulty for a sufficiently long time period for the pre-conditions for convergence of the protocol to hold. The assumption in this paper, as underlies any other self-stabilizing algorithm, is that the system eventually becomes coherent.

Definition 6. (System Convergence) *The system is said to be **stable** at times that it complies with the following:*

- (converging) *The system has been coherent for Δ_{stb} time units;*⁸

³A non-faulty network might fail to deliver messages within the bound but will be masked as a fault and accounted for in the f faults. Essentially, we assume that messages among correct nodes are delivered within the time bounds.

⁴Nodes that were not faulty when the message was sent.

⁵We assume $\Delta_{net} \geq d$.

⁶ Δ_{node} is defined in the next section

⁷The condition can be replaced by $(n + f)/2$ correct nodes with some modifications to the structure of the protocol.

⁸We define Δ_{stb} in the next section.

- (stability) *The system remained coherent since that time.*

It is assumed that each node has a local timer that proceeds at the rate of real-time. The actual reading of the various timers may be arbitrarily apart, but their relative rate is bounded in our model. To distinguish between a real-time value and a node's local-time reading we use t for the former and τ for the latter. The function $rt(\tau_p)$ represents the real-time when the timer of a non-faulty node p reads (or read) τ_p at the current execution.

Observe that the local time at a node may wrap around, since we assume transient faults. The protocol and the primitives presented below require measuring only intervals of times. It is assumed that the local time wrap around is larger than a constant factor of the maximal interval of time need to be measured. This way a node can uniquely measure any necessary intervals of time.

Since nodes measure only intervals of time that span several d , and d itself includes a worst case drift factor, by definition, then d is an upper bound on the time it takes to send and process messages among correct nodes, measured by each local timer, *i.e.*, including the drift factor.

3 The SS-BYZ-AGREE protocol

We consider the Byzantine agreement problem in which a *General* broadcasts a value and the correct nodes agree on the value broadcasted. In our model any node can be a General. An instance of the protocol is executed per General, and a correct General is expected to send one value at a time.⁹ The target is for the correct nodes to associate a local-time with the protocol initiation by the General and to agree on a specific value associated with that initiation, if they agree that such an initiation actually took place. There is a bound on how frequent a correct General may initiate agreements, though Byzantine nodes might try to trigger agreements on their values at an arbitrary rate.

The SS-BYZ-AGREE protocol is composed of the Agreement procedure (the main body of the protocol) and two primitives: the primitive INITIATOR-ACCEPT and the MSGD-BROADCAST one (as detailed later). The General, G , initiates an agreement on a value m by disseminating the message $(Initiator, G, m)$ to all nodes. Upon receiving the General's message, each node invokes the SS-BYZ-AGREE protocol, which in turn invokes the primitive INITIATOR-ACCEPT. Alternatively, if a correct node did not receive the General's message but concludes that enough nodes have invoked the protocol (or the primitive) it will participate by executing the appropriate parts of the primitive INITIATOR-ACCEPT (but will not invoke it), and following the completion of the primitive that node may participate in the corresponding parts of the agreement procedure.

We will prove the following properties of the SS-BYZ-AGREE protocol. When the system is stable, if all correct nodes invoke the protocol within a "small" time-window, as will happen if the General is a correct node, then it is ensured that the correct nodes agree on a value for the General. If the General is a correct node, the agreed value will be the value sent by the General. When not all correct nodes happen to invoke the SS-BYZ-AGREE protocol within a small time-window, as can happen if the General is faulty, then if any correct node accepts a non-null value, all correct nodes will accept and agree on that value.

⁹One can expand the protocol to a number of concurrent invocations by using an index to differentiate among the concurrent invocations.

```

Protocol SS-BYZ-AGREE on  $(G, m)$     /* Executed at node  $q$ .  $\tau_q$  is the local-time
at  $q$ . */

/* Block  $Q$  is executed only when (and if) invoked. */
/* The rest is executed following a setting of a value to  $\tau_q^G$ . */
/* At most one of blocks  $R$  through  $U$  is executed per such a setting of  $\tau_q^G$ .
*/

Q0. If  $q = G$  then send (Initiator,  $G, m$ ) to all .    /* initiation of the
primitive by the leader */

Q1. If received (Initiator,  $G, m$ ) invoke INITIATOR-ACCEPT( $G, m$ ).
/* determines  $\tau_q^G$  and a value  $m'$  for node  $G$  */

R1. if I-accept  $\langle G, m', \tau_q^G \rangle$  and  $\tau_q - \tau_q^G \leq 4d$  then
R2.   value :=  $\langle G, m' \rangle$ ;
R3.   MSGD-BROADCAST( $q, value, 1$ );
R4.   stop and return  $\langle value, \tau_q^G \rangle$ .

S1. if by  $\tau_q$ ,  $\tau_q \leq \tau_q^G + (2r + 1) \cdot \Phi$ ,
    accepted  $r$  distinct messages  $(p_i, \langle G, m'' \rangle, i)$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq r$ ,
    where  $\forall i, j$   $1 \leq i, j \leq r$  and  $p_i \neq p_j \neq G$ , then
S2.   value :=  $\langle G, m'' \rangle$ ;
S3.   MSGD-BROADCAST( $q, value, r + 1$ );
S4.   stop and return  $\langle value, \tau_q^G \rangle$ .

T1. if by  $\tau_q$ ,  $\tau_q > \tau_q^G + (2r + 1) \cdot \Phi$ ,  $|broadcasters| < r - 1$  then
T2.   stop and return  $\langle \perp, \tau_q^G \rangle$ .

U1. if  $\tau_q > \tau_q^G + (2f + 1) \cdot \Phi$  then
U2.   stop and return  $\langle \perp, \tau_q^G \rangle$ .

cleanup:
- Erase any value or message older than  $(2f + 1) \cdot \Phi + 3d$  time units.
-  $3d$  after returning a value reset INITIATOR-ACCEPT,  $\tau_q^G$ , and
MSGD-BROADCAST.

```

Figure 1: The SS-BYZ-AGREE protocol

For ease of following the arguments and the logic of our SS-BYZ-AGREE protocol, we chose to follow the building-block structure of [14]. The primitive MSGD-BROADCAST, presented in Section 5, replaces the broadcast primitive that simulates authentication in [14]. The main differences between the original synchronous broadcast primitive and MSGD-BROADCAST are two-folds: first, the latter executes rounds that are anchored at some agreed event whose local-time is supplied to the primitive through a parameter; second, the conditions to be satisfied at each round at the latter need to be satisfied by some time span that is a function of the round number and need not be executed only during the round itself. This allows nodes to rush through the protocol in the typical case when messages among correct nodes happen to be delivered faster than the worse case round span.

The SS-BYZ-AGREE protocol needs to take into consideration that correct nodes may invoke the agreement procedure at arbitrary times and with no knowledge as to when other correct nodes may have invoked the procedure. A mechanism is thus needed to make all correct nodes attain some common notion

as to when the General may have sent a value, and what that value is. The differences of the real-time representations of the different nodes' estimations should be bounded. This mechanism is satisfied by the primitive INITIATOR-ACCEPT, presented in Section 4. The use of this initial step in the protocol provides the nodes with an initial potential value of the General, and as a result number of “rounds” necessary to reach agreement is two less than those of [14].

We use the following notations in the description of the agreement procedure and the related primitives:

- Let Φ be the duration of time equal to $(\tau_{skew}^G + 2d)$ local-time units on a correct node's timer, where $\tau_{skew}^G = 6d$ in the context of this paper. Intuitively, Φ is the duration of a “phase” on a correct node's timer.
- Δ_{agr} , the upper bound on the time it takes to run the agreement protocol, will be equal to $(2f+1) \cdot \Phi$.
- $\Delta_0 = 13d$, the minimal time between consecutive invocations of the protocol by the General, for different values.
- $\Delta_{rmv} = (\Delta_{agr} + \Delta_0)$, the time after which old values are decayed.
- $\Delta_v = (15d + 2\Delta_{rmv})$, the minimal time between two invocations of the protocol by the General, for the same value.
- $\Delta_{node} = \Delta_v + \Delta_{agr}$, the time it takes for a non-faulty node to be considered correct.
- $\Delta_{reset} = 20d + 4\Delta_{rmv}$, the time during which the General sends nothing, when it notices a failure in agreeing on a value it sent.
- $\Delta_{stb} = 2\Delta_{reset}$, stabilization time of the system.
- $\perp$ denotes a null value.
- In the primitive INITIATOR-ACCEPT:
 - An I-accept¹⁰ is issued on values sent by G .
 - τ_q^G denotes the local-time estimate, at node q , as to when the General has sent the value associated with the I-accept by node q .

In the context of this paper we assume that a correct General conform with the following criteria when sending its messages.

Sending Validity Criteria: A non-faulty General G sends (Initiator, G, m) provided that:

- [IG1] At least Δ_0 time passed from the sending of the previous initiation message by G .
- [IG2] At least Δ_v time passed from the sending of previous initiation message with the same value m by G .

Notice that both limitations can be circumvented by adding counters to concurrent agreement initiations. The difference between the two cases has to do with the ability to converge from an arbitrary initial state. If a node can send the same message again and again repeatedly, there is a way for the adversary to confuse of convergence protocol, as can be seen in the next section.

¹⁰An *accept* is issued within MSGD-BROADCAST.

Definition 7. We say:

- A node p **decides** at time τ if it stops at that local-time and returns value $\neq \perp$.
- A node p **aborts** if it stops and returns $\perp$.
- A node p **returns** a value if it either aborts or decides.

The SS-BYZ-AGREE protocol is presented (see Figure 1) in a somewhat different style than the original protocol in [14]. Each round has a precondition associated with it: if the local timer value associated with the initialization by the General is defined and the precondition holds then the step is to be executed. It is assumed that the primitives' instances invoked as a result of the SS-BYZ-AGREE protocol are implicitly associated with the agreement instance that invoked them. A node stops participating in the procedures once it returns a value and it stopped participating in the invoked primitives $3d$ time units after that. We use the term participate to refer to a node that executes the protocol's (and primitives') steps. The term invoke will refer to a node that also executes the first block of the protocol (Block Q) or primitive (Block K), as each correct node would do if the General is a correct one. A node accumulates messages associated with the protocol even before it invokes it or participates in it. Such messages are decayed if the node doesn't invoke or participate in the protocol, or being processed once it does.

The SS-BYZ-AGREE protocol satisfies the following typical properties, provided that the system is stable:

Agreement: If any correct node decides (G, m) , all correct nodes decide the same;

Validity: If the General invokes SS-BYZ-AGREE then each correct node decides on the value sent by G ;

Termination: The protocol terminates in a finite time.

Note that in light of our definitions, the Agreement property actually says that if the protocol returns a value $\neq \perp$ at any correct node, it returns the same value at all correct nodes.

The SS-BYZ-AGREE protocol also satisfies the following timing properties:

Timeliness:

1. (agreement) If a correct node q decides on (G, m) at τ_q then any correct node q' decides on (G, m) at some $\tau_{q'}$ such that,
 - (a) $|rt(\tau_q) - rt(\tau_{q'})| \leq 3d$, and if validity holds, then $|rt(\tau_q) - rt(\tau_{q'})| \leq 2d$;
 - (b) $|rt(\tau_q^G) - rt(\tau_{q'}^G)| \leq 6d$;
 - (c) $rt(\tau_q^G), rt(\tau_{q'}^G) \in [t_1 - 2d, t_2]$, where $[t_1, t_2]$ is the interval within which each correct node, p , that obtained the τ_p^G appearing in (b) following the invocation of SS-BYZ-AGREE (G, m) , did so;
 - (d) $rt(\tau_q^G) \leq rt(\tau_q)$ and $rt(\tau_q) - rt(\tau_q^G) \leq \Delta_{agr}$.
2. (validity) If all correct nodes invoked the protocol in an interval $[t_0, t_0 + d]$, as a result of some value m sent by a correct General G that conform with the Sending Validity Criteria, then for every correct node q , the decision time τ_q , satisfies $t_0 - d \leq rt(\tau_q^G) \leq rt(\tau_q) \leq t_0 + 4d$.

3. (termination) The protocol terminates within Δ_{agr} time units of invocation, and within $\Delta_{agr} + 7d$ in case it was not invoked explicitly.
4. (separation) Let p and q be two correct nodes that decided on agreements regarding G , then
 - (a) for $m \neq m'$, $|rt(\tau_q^G) - rt(\tau_p^G)| > 4d$;
 - (b) for $m = m'$, either $|rt(\tau_q^G) - rt(\tau_p^G)| \leq 6d$ or $|rt(\tau_q^G) - rt(\tau_p^G)| > 2\Delta_{rmv} - 3d$

Note that the bounds in the above property is with respect to d , the bound on message transmission time among correct nodes and not the worse case deviation represented by Φ .

Observe that since there is no prior notion of the possibility that a value may be sent, it might be that some nodes associate a $\perp$ with a faulty sending and others may not notice the sending at all.

The proof that the SS-BYZ-AGREE protocol meets its properties appears in [Section 6.3](#).

4 The primitive INITIATOR-ACCEPT

In a typical agreement protocol a General that wants to send some value broadcasts it in a specific round (say the first round of the protocol). From the assumptions on synchrony all correct nodes can check whether a value was indeed sent at the specified round and whether multiple (faulty) values were sent. In the transient fault model no such round number can be set beforehand adjoined with the broadcast. Thus a faulty General has more power in trying to fool the correct nodes by sending its values at completely different times to whichever nodes it chooses.

The primitive INITIATOR-ACCEPT aims at making the correct nodes associate a local time with the invocation of the protocol (and primitive) by (the possibly faulty) General, and to converge to a single candidate value for the agreement to come. Since the full invocation of the protocol by a faulty General might be questionable, there may be cases in which some correct nodes will return a $\perp$ value and others will not identify the invocation as valid. But, as we will prove, if any correct node happens to return a value $\neq \perp$ within a given timeframe, all correct nodes will return the same value.

In order to initiate the process of broadcasting its value (one value at a time) the General sends (Initiator, G, m) to all nodes, provided some validity criteria are met, as we detail below. As a response to that initiation message, each non-faulty node (including the General) invokes the primitive INITIATOR-ACCEPT. Each node dynamically executes the primitive, whenever relevant messages are being received, to obtain an estimate to its (relative) local-time at which the primitive may have been initiated. The primitive guarantees that all correct nodes' estimates are within some bounded real-time of each other.

To ensure convergence we need to add to the two Sending Validity Criteria of [Section 3](#) a third one:

- [IG3] No invocation of INITIATOR-ACCEPT ($G, *$) failed in the last Δ_{reset} time, where an invocation is considered failed if any of the following is failed: executing lines L4, M4 or N4 of the INITIATOR-ACCEPT primitive (see [Figure 2](#)) is not completed within $2d$, $3d$ or $4d$ of the invocation, respectively.

The General, before initiating the primitive, removes from its memory all previously received messages associated with any previous invocation of the primitive with him as a General.

```

Primitive INITIATOR-ACCEPT ( $G, m$ )    /* Executed at node  $q$ .  $\tau_q$  is the local-time at  $q$ .
*/
    /* Block  $K$  is executed only when (and if) the primitive is explicitly invoked. */
    /* Lines L1 through N3 are repeatedly executed upon receiving messages. */

K1. if  $i\_values[G, m'] = \perp$  for every  $m' \neq m$  &  $last_q(G) = \perp$  &
    did not send any ( $support, G, *$ ) in  $[\tau_q - d, \tau_q]$  & /* allow for recent messages */
     $last_q(G, m) = \perp$  at  $\tau_q - d$  then
K2.    $i\_values[G, m] := \tau_q - d$ ; /* recording time */
    send ( $support, G, m$ ) to all;  $last_q(G, m) = \tau_q$ ;

L1. if received ( $support, G, m$ ) from  $\geq n - 2f$  distinct nodes
    in the interval  $[\tau_q - \alpha, \tau_q]$  for  $\alpha \leq 4d$  then /* shortest interval */
L2.    $i\_values[G, m] := \max\{i\_values[G, m], (\tau_q - \alpha - 2d)\}$ ;  $last_q(G, m) = \tau_q$ ; /* recording
time */
L3. if received ( $support, G, m$ ) from  $\geq n - f$  distinct nodes
    in the interval  $[\tau_q - 2d, \tau_q]$  then
L4.   send ( $approve, G, m$ ) to all;  $last_q(G, m) = \tau_q$ ; /* if not recently sent */

M1. if received ( $approve, G, m$ ) from  $\geq n - 2f$  distinct nodes
    in the interval  $[\tau_q - 5d, \tau_q]$  then
M2.    $ready_{G, m} = \text{'true'}$ ;  $last_q(G, m) = \tau_q$ ;
M3. if received ( $approve, G, m$ ) from  $\geq n - f$  distinct nodes
    in the interval  $[\tau_q - 3d, \tau_q]$  then
M4.   send ( $ready, G, m$ ) to all;  $last_q(G, m) = \tau_q$ ;

N1. if  $ready_{G, m}$  & received ( $ready, G, m$ ) from  $\geq n - 2f$  distinct nodes then
N2.   send ( $ready, G, m$ ) to all;  $last_q(G, m) = \tau_q$ ;
N3. if  $ready_{G, m}$  & received ( $ready, G, m$ ) from  $\geq n - f$  distinct nodes then
N4.    $\tau_q^G := i\_values[G, m]$ ;  $i\_values[G, *] := \perp$ ;
    remove all ( $G, m$ ) messages and ignore all ( $G, m$ ) messages for  $3d$ ;
    I-accept ( $G, m, \tau_q^G$ );  $last_q(G, m) = \tau_q$ ;  $last_q(G) := \tau_q$ .

cleanup:
    Remove any value or message that is older than  $\Delta_{rmv}$  time units;
    If  $last_q(G) > \tau_q$  or  $last_q(G) < \tau_q - (\Delta_0 - 6d)$  then  $last_q(G) := \perp$ .
    If  $last_q(G, m) > \tau_q$  or  $last_q(G, m) < \tau_q - (2\Delta_{rmv} + 9d)$  then  $last_q(G, m) := \perp$ .

```

Figure 2: The primitive INITIATOR-ACCEPT

Each correct node records the local-time at which it receives each message associated with the invocation of the primitive, for the specific General. Whenever a new message arrives the node records it and its time of arrival. The node goes through the primitive and considers all the various lines of the primitive, one by one, and acts accordingly. Notice that the node processes all messages, even if it did not invoke the primitive.

We say that a node does an I-accept of a value sent by the General if it accepts this value as the General's initial value, and τ_q^G is the estimated local-time at q associated with the initiation of the primitive by the General.

Each node maintains a list $i_values[G, *]$ for the possible concurrent values sent by the General G , where each non-empty entry is a local-time associated with the possible invocation of the primitive with that entry value. The list should contain at most a single value if the General it correct. Each node also

maintains for each non empty entry a time variable, $last(G, m)$, that indicates the latest time at which any stage of the primitive was executed regarding the specific value m . To ensure the compliance of the General with the rules of initiating the primitive each node also maintains an additional time variable, $last(G)$, measuring the minimal time between two consecutive invocations of the primitive by the General.

Each entry has an expiration time, and messages have a decay time, so after some time all residue of previous invocations are removed. The variables are set to $\perp$ as a result of resetting them. The INITIATOR-ACCEPT primitive requires the knowledge of the state of the vector $i_values[G, *]$ d time units in the past. It is assumed that the data structure reflects that information.

Definition 8. *The data structure of a node is fresh with respect to a value m if d units of time ago $i_values[G, *]$ did not contain any value and the time variables $last(G, m)$, and $last(G)$ both were $\perp$.*

Thus, as we prove later on, when the data structure is fresh and a correct node receives an initiation message from a correct G it will be able to execute successfully Block K of the INITIATOR-ACCEPT primitive.

Before stating the properties that the primitive INITIATOR-ACCEPT satisfies we give some intuition regarding it. The primitive is composed of five sections: four of them are commands to execute in response of receiving messages and the final one is a cleanup process that is carried on in the background.

Block K states the rules for the invocation of the primitive. It is executed as a result of receiving a (Initiator, G, m) message from G .

Line K1 lists the tests a node carries to ensure that G respects the Sending Validity Criteria. The nodes tests whether any other broadcasts of messages were processed not too long ago. Since the message from G may take d to arrive, and responses to such a message from other correct nodes may have been received already. Therefore the node checks what was the status of its data structure d time units ago. It checks whether it recently responded to any initiation message or whether it processed the relevant message from other nodes only in the last d units of time.

Line K2: the node sends its support message to all nodes, and marks the time of sending. The sending event entry is marked as a time prior to the invocation of the primitive, therefore d is reduced.

Block L intends to capture the fact that enough correct nodes have sent the support messages within a short period of one another. If that happens an approved message is being produced.

Line L1: The node tests whether at least one correct node has invoked the primitive in the last $4d$ time units.

Line L2: The node marks that latest such event. The node reduces $2d$ to mark a time prior to an invocation event would G was a correct node.

Line L3: The node checks whether at least $t + 1$ correct nodes have sent support within d of each other. Notice that since some messages may take 0 time to arrive and some may take d the interval is $2d$. Notice also that if at some correct node this is true, at all correct nodes the test of Line L1 is true.

Line L4: Since the node knows that every correct node will end up executing Line L2, and d after that all will have Line L3 enabled, it is safe to send an approve message.

The general controls the previous blocks by deciding when to send the invocation messages to which correct node. We now moved to two stages that are controlled by the correct nodes that send the approval messages, and there is a need to prevent transient messages that may happen to be in the memory of the correct nodes from separating the agreement among correct nodes.

Block M intends to verify that all correct nodes have moved a stage before we move to the acceptance stage. If enough correct have sent approve within a small time window a ready message will be produced.

Line M1: The node tests whether at least one correct node has sent a recent approve.

Line M2: In such a case, the correct node marks that by setting the ready variable, which will mark its potential readiness to move to the final stage and to join others in Line N2.

Line M3: The node checks whether every correct node will notice the sending of an approve message.

Line M4: In such a case the node sends a ready message and move to the final stage.

Block N is the only block that is not timed by a short interval, in order to enable nodes that may be initial spread around to collect their actions. If enough have noticed the readiness to accept the message by the general, all will.

Line N1: The node tests whether at least one correct node has sent a ready message and whether it is ready to move to the final stage.

Line N2: In such a case, the correct node amplifies the sending and sends its own ready message.

Line M3: The node checks whether every correct node will notice the sending of ready messages.

Line M4: in such a case the node set the potential time of the invocation of the protocols by G and accepts the sending. In order to prevent recurrence accepting the node clear messages and ignore messages for a short time period.

Block Cleanup has three parts. Any message that is too old is removed. The other two parts rest the two variables that measure the elapse time between two consecutive invocations of the same value and of different values. The reason that the expiration of $last_q(G, m)$ is almost twice Δ_{rmv} is to separate consecutive sending of the same value from the possible transient messages at startup.

Recall that a node is required to keep time stamps associated with the various entries in its data structures and the messages it has received. Each time-stamped entry that is clearly wrong, with respect to the current clock reading of τ_q , is removed; *i.e.*, future time stamps or too old time stamps.

The primitive INITIATOR-ACCEPT satisfies the following properties, provided that the system is stable:

[IA-1] (Correctness) If a correct General G invokes INITIATOR-ACCEPT (G, m) at t_0 then:

[1A] All correct nodes I-accept $\langle G, m, \tau^G \rangle$ within $4d$ time units of the invocation;

[1B] All correct nodes I-accept $\langle G, m, \tau^G \rangle$ within $2d$ time units of each other;

[1C] For every pair of correct nodes q and q' that I-accepts $\langle G, m, \tau_q^G \rangle$ and $\langle G, m, \tau_{q'}^G \rangle$, respectively:

$$|rt(\tau_{q'}^G) - rt(\tau_q^G)| \leq d;$$

[1D] For each correct node q that I-accepts $\langle G, m, \tau_q^G \rangle$ at τ_q , $t_0 - d \leq rt(\tau_q^G) \leq rt(\tau_q) \leq t_0 + 4d$.

[IA-2] (Unforgeability) If no correct node invokes INITIATOR-ACCEPT (G, m) , then no correct node I-accepts $\langle G, m, \tau^G \rangle$.

[IA-3] (Δ_{agr} -Relay) If a correct node q I-accepts $\langle G, m, \tau_q^G \rangle$ at real-time t , such that $t - rt(\tau_q^G) \leq \Delta_{agr}$, then:

[3A] Every correct node q' I-accepts $\langle G, m, \tau_{q'}^G \rangle$, at some real-time t' , with $|t - t'| \leq 2d$ and

$$|rt(\tau_q^G) - rt(\tau_{q'}^G)| \leq 6d;$$

[3B] Moreover, for every correct node q' , $rt(\tau_{q'}^G) \leq t_2$, where some correct node invoked the primitive INITIATOR-ACCEPT at t_2 ;

[3C] For every correct node q' , $rt(\tau_{q'}^G) \leq rt(\tau_{q'}^G)$ and $rt(\tau_{q'}^G) - rt(\tau_q^G) \leq \Delta_{agr} + 8d$.

[IA-4] (*Uniqueness*) If a correct node q I-accepts $\langle G, m, \tau_q^G \rangle$, and a correct node I-accepts $\langle G, m', \tau_p^G \rangle$, then

[4A] for $m \neq m'$, $|rt(\tau_q^G) - rt(\tau_p^G)| > 4d$;

[4b] for $m = m'$, either $|rt(\tau_q^G) - rt(\tau_p^G)| \leq 6d$ or $|rt(\tau_q^G) - rt(\tau_p^G)| > 2\Delta_{rmv} - 3d$.

When the primitive is invoked the node executes Block K. A node may receive messages related to the primitive, even in case that it did not invoke the primitive. In this case it executes the rest of the blocks of the primitive, if the appropriate preconditions hold. A correct node repeatedly executes each line until it execute Line N4. So we assume that a node may send the same message several times. We ignore possible optimizations that can save such repetitive sending of messages. Once a node executes Line N4 it removes all associated messages and ignores related messages for some time, so Line-N4 is not executed more than once per execution of the primitive.

Notice that since Block N is not timed, its expiration is determined by the expiration of old messages, which leads to the definition of Δ_{rmv} . and Δ_v . Following the completion of SS-BYZ-AGREE, the data structures of the related INITIATOR-ACCEPT instance are reset.

The proof that the INITIATOR-ACCEPT primitive satisfies the [IA- $\ast$] properties, under the assumption that $n > 3f$, appears in [Section 6.1](#). The proofs also show that from any initial state, after Δ_{stb} the system becomes stable.

5 The MSGD-BROADCAST Primitive

This section presents the MSGD-BROADCAST (a message driven broadcast) primitive, which **accepts** messages being **broadcasted**. The primitive is invoked within the SS-BYZ-AGREE protocol presented in [Section 3](#). The primitive follows the broadcast primitive of Toueg, Perry, and Srikanth [14]. In the original synchronous model, nodes advance according to rounds that are divided into phases. This intuitive lock-step process clarifies the presentation and simplifies the proofs. Here the primitive MSGD-BROADCAST is presented without any explicit or implicit reference to absolute time or round number, rather an anchor to the potential initialization point of the protocol is passed as a parameter by the calling procedure. The properties of the INITIATOR-ACCEPT primitive guarantee a bound between the real-time of the anchors of the correct nodes. Thus a general notion of a common round structure can be implemented by measuring the time elapsed since the anchor.

In the broadcast primitive of [14] messages associated with a certain round must be sent by correct nodes at that round and will be received, the latest, at the end of that round by all correct nodes. In MSGD-BROADCAST, on the other hand, the rounds progress with the arrival of the anticipated messages.

```

Primitive MSGD-BROADCAST ( $p, m, k$ )
    /* Executed per such triplet at node  $q$ . */
    /* Nodes send specific messages only once. */
    /* Nodes execute the blocks only when  $\tau^G$  is defined. */
    /* Nodes log messages until they are able to process them. */
    /* Multiple messages sent by an individual node are ignored. */

    At node  $q = p$ : /* if node  $q$  is node  $p$  that invoked the primitive */
V.    node  $p$  sends ( $init, p, m, k$ ) to all nodes;

W1.  At time  $\tau_q : \tau_q \leq \tau_q^G + 2k \cdot \Phi$ 
W2.    if received ( $init, p, m, k$ ) from  $p$  then
W3.        send ( $echo, p, m, k$ ) to all;

X1.  At time  $\tau_q : \tau_q \leq \tau_q^G + (2k + 1) \cdot \Phi$ 
X2.    if received ( $echo, p, m, k$ ) from  $\geq n - 2f$  distinct nodes then
X3.        send ( $init', p, m, k$ ) to all;
X4.    if received ( $echo, p, m, k$ ) messages from  $\geq n - f$  distinct nodes then
X5.        accept ( $p, m, k$ );

Y1.  At time  $\tau_q : \tau_q \leq \tau_q^G + (2k + 2) \cdot \Phi$ 
Y2.    if received ( $init', p, m, k$ ) from  $\geq n - 2f$  then
Y3.         $broadcasters := broadcasters \cup \{p\}$ ;
Y4.    if received ( $init', p, m, k$ ) from  $\geq n - f$  distinct nodes then
Y5.        send ( $echo', p, m, k$ ) to all;

Z1.  At any time:
Z2.    if received ( $echo', p, m, k$ ) from  $\geq n - 2f$  distinct nodes then
Z3.        send ( $echo', p, m, k$ ) to all;
Z4.    if received ( $echo', p, m, k$ ) from  $\geq n - f$  distinct nodes then
Z5.        accept ( $p, m, k$ ); /* accept only once */

cleanup:
    Remove any value or message older than  $(2f + 3) \cdot \Phi$  time units.

```

Figure 3: The MSGD-BROADCAST primitive with message-driven round structure

Thus for example, if a node receives some required messages before the end of the round it may send next round's messages. The length of a round only imposes an upper bound on the acceptance criteria. Thus the protocol can progress at the speed of message delivery, which may be significantly faster than that of the protocol in [14].

Note that when a node invokes the primitive it evaluates all the messages in its buffer that are relevant to the primitive. The MSGD-BROADCAST primitive is executed in the context of some initiator G that invoked SS-BYZ-AGREE, which makes use of the MSGD-BROADCAST primitive. No correct node will execute the MSGD-BROADCAST primitive without first producing the reference (anchor), τ^G , on its local timer to the time estimate at which G supposedly invoked the original agreement. By 1A-3A this happens within $6d$ of the other correct nodes.

The synchronous Reliable Broadcast procedure of [14] assumes a round model in which within each phase all message exchange among correct nodes take place. The equivalent notion of a round in our context will be Φ defined to be: $\Phi := t_{\text{skew}}^G + 2d$.

The MSGD-BROADCAST primitive satisfies the following [TPS-*] properties of Toueg, Perry and Srikanth [14], which are phrased in our system model.

- TPS-1** (*Correctness*) If a correct node p MSGD-BROADCAST (p, m, k) at τ_p , where $\tau_p \leq \tau_p^G + (2k - 1) \cdot \Phi$, on its timer, then each correct node q accepts (p, m, k) at some τ_q , $\tau_q \leq \tau_q^G + (2k + 1) \cdot \Phi$, on its timer and $|rt(\tau_p) - rt(\tau_q)| \leq 3d$.
- TPS-2** (*Unforgeability*) If a correct node p does not MSGD-BROADCAST (p, m, k) , then no correct node accepts (p, m, k) .
- TPS-3** (*Relay*) If a correct node q_1 accepts (p, m, k) at τ_1 , $\tau_1 \leq \tau_1^G + r \cdot \Phi$ on its timer then any other correct node q_2 accepts (p, m, k) at some τ_2 , $\tau_2 \leq \tau_2^G + (r + 2) \cdot \Phi$, on its timer.
- TPS-4** (*Detection of broadcasters*) If a correct node accepts (p, m, k) then every correct node q has $p \in \text{broadcasters}$ at some τ_q , $\tau_q \leq \tau_q^G + (2k + 2) \cdot \Phi$, on its timer. Furthermore, if a correct node p does not MSGD-BROADCAST any message, then a correct node can never have $p \in \text{broadcasters}$.

Note that the bounds in [TPS-1] are with respect to d , the bound on message transmission time among correct nodes.

When the system is stable, the MSGD-BROADCAST primitive satisfies the [TPS-*] properties, under the assumption that $n > 3f$. The proofs that appear in Section 6.2 follow closely the original proofs of [14], in order to make it easier for readers that are familiar with the original proofs.

6 Proofs

Note that all the definitions, theorems and lemmata in this paper hold only from the moment, and as long as, the system is stable.

6.1 Proof of the INITIATOR-ACCEPT Properties

In the proof we distinguish between the initiation of the primitive INITIATOR-ACCEPT by the General that is done by sending $(\text{Initiator}, G, m)$ to all nodes, and the invocation of the primitive INITIATOR-ACCEPT by the non-faulty nodes as a result of receiving the above message. Notice that the General himself plays a double role; it also invokes the primitive.

Nodes continuously run the primitive, in the sense that for each incoming message the various “if statements” are tested. We say that a node *executes* a line in the code when the appropriate “if condition” holds. In the proofs below, we omit the reference to (G, m) when it is clear from the context. Thus, when we refer to a node executing a line it is assumed that it is with (G, m) and that the “if” condition holds.

Claim 1. *If a correct General G doesn't initiate INITIATOR-ACCEPT in an interval $[\bar{t} - \Delta_{\text{reset}}, \bar{t})$ then,*

1. *at $\bar{t}$ when G initiates the primitive INITIATOR-ACCEPT with m , all correct nodes will execute successfully Line K1 and will send $(\text{support}, G, m)$ in the interval $[\bar{t}, \bar{t} + d]$;*
2. *by $\bar{t} + 4d$ all correct nodes will execute Line N4, within $2d$ of each other;*

3. at any $t' \geq \bar{t}$, if the correct G initiates its INITIATOR-ACCEPT with value m' and G did not initiate any INITIATOR-ACCEPT in the interval $[t' - \Delta_0, t')$ and G did not initiate any INITIATOR-ACCEPT with m' in the interval $[t' - \Delta_v, t')$ then all correct nodes will execute successfully Line K1 and will send $(support, G, m')$ in the interval $[t', t' + d]$, and by $t' + 4d$ all correct nodes will execute Line N4, within $2d$ of each other.

Proof. Notice that $(support, G, m)$ messages are sent only as a result of receiving the initiation message from the General. Recall that $\Delta_v = 15d + 2\Delta_{rmv}$ and $\Delta_{reset} = 20d + 4\Delta_{rmv}$. Define $t = \bar{t} - 20d - 4\Delta_{rmv}$. In the proof we consider only nodes that are correct from time t on. At $t + d$ some correct nodes may still end up executing (successfully¹¹) Block K and may end up sending $(support, G, m)$, because of some presumably previously received messages; but past $t + d$, by the code of the primitive, no correct node would execute it any more. The last $(support, G, m)$ message resulting from that activity may reach some non-faulty node the latest by $t + 2d$. For that reason, past $t + 6d$, no correct node will execute Block L until a new initiation message will be received by some correct node.

The latest $(approve, G, m)$ may be sent by $t + 4d$ and reach others by $t + 5d$. But past $t + 10d$, no correct node will execute Block M. Notice that faulty nodes may still influence some correct nodes to execute Block N and it might be that some and not all correct nodes will follow them.

By $t + 10d + \Delta_{rmv}$ the variable $ready_{G,m}$ (for all possible values of m) will decay at all correct nodes and none will execute Block N or update $last(G, m)$ anymore. By $t + 10d + 2\Delta_{rmv} + d$ no correct node will hold in its memory any message claimed to be sent by a correct node and all variables in all data structures, including $last_q(G)$, will decay. The variable $last_q(G, m)$ will decay at all correct nodes by $t + 10d + 2\Delta_{rmv} + 2\Delta_{rmv} + 9d = t + 19d + 4\Delta_{rmv} = t + \Delta_{reset} - d$.

Therefore, if at time $\bar{t}$ the correct G will initiate INITIATOR-ACCEPT with any m , all correct nodes will execute successfully Line K1 and will send $support$ within d of each other, completing the proof of the first item of the claim.

To prove the second item of the claim, notice that by $\bar{t} + 2d$ all correct nodes will execute successfully Line L4, and by $\bar{t} + 3d$ all will execute successfully both lines M2 and M4. By $\bar{t} + 4d$ all will execute successfully Line N4. Let q be the first correct node executing Line N4 at some time t_1 in this interval, following its execution of lines M4 and N3. By $t_1 + d$ all will execute Line N2 and by $t_1 + 2d$ all will execute Line N4, and will set the value of $last(G, m)$ and $last_q(G)$.

To prove the third item of the claim we will use a mathematical induction on the initiations of INITIATOR-ACCEPT past time $\bar{t}$. Since the correct G initiates INITIATOR-ACCEPT sequentially, the order of initiations is well defined. Let $i, i \geq 0$, be the index describing the order of initiations past time $\bar{t}$. Case $i = 0$ holds by the first two items of the claim.

Assume that the third item holds for $i - 1$ and prove it for i . Let t be the time at which the $i - 1$ initiation started. By the induction hypothesis, and by the code of the primitive, by $t + 4d + \Delta_0 - 6d < t + \Delta_0$ all will reset $last_q(G)$. Therefore, by t' all non-faulty have reset the value of $last_q(G)$. If G did not initiate INITIATOR-ACCEPT with m' after time $t' - \Delta_v$, then by the proof of the first item of the claim, all will execute Block K. The flow of the proof of the second item of the claim completes the proof.

Otherwise, let $t_0, t_0 \geq \bar{t}$, be the last time G initiated INITIATOR-ACCEPT with m' . By the induction hypothesis, by $t_0 + 4d$ all non-faulty nodes will execute Line N4 and by $t_0 + 4d + 2\Delta_{rmv} + 9d$ all would

¹¹We omit the term “successfully” from now on

have reset $last(G, m')$. Since $t_0 + 4d + 2\Delta_{rmv} + 9d < t_0 + \Delta_v \leq t'$, again, all will execute Block K, and following the arguments of the first two items, the claim holds. $\square$

The proof can be extended to prove the following corollary for non-faulty nodes that become correct.

Corollary 1. *Claim 1 holds for any set of at least $n - f - 1$ nodes and a General that are all non-faulty from time $\bar{t} - \Delta_{reset}$ on.*

In the proofs below we need to refer to the coherency of the system and to the minimal time past from the time the network becomes correct. We denote by ι_0 the time by which the network becomes correct and there are at least $n - f$ non-faulty nodes that remain non-faulty from that time on. The system is considered *stable* from time $\iota_1 = \iota_0 + 2\Delta_{reset}$, and as long as the system remains coherent.

In the rest of this section, in all the claims and proofs, whenever we refer to a non-faulty node we imply a non-faulty node that remains non-faulty from time ι_0 on.

Lemma 1. *Once the system is stable, at any time past time ι_1 , if a correct General G initiates the primitive INITIATOR-ACCEPT at some time $\hat{t}$, not sooner than Δ_0 of the beginning of the previous initiation, and not sooner than Δ_v of the last initiation with the same value m , then within d of the initiation, all correct nodes will send $(support, G, m)$. Moreover, by $\hat{t} + 4d$ all correct nodes will execute Line N4, within $2d$ of each other.*

Proof. Recall that ι_0 is the time by which the network became correct, as defined above. Before ι_0 every non-faulty node may have arbitrary values in the various variables of INITIATOR-ACCEPT and some of the messages being accumulated may be a result of the transient fault.

Past $\iota_0 + d$ all received messages claimed to be sent by non-faulty nodes were actually sent by non-faulty nodes. Observe that messages resulting from the initial arbitrary state may be sent by non-faulty nodes as a result of their initial state without actually receiving the required messages, since such messages may be in their initial memory state.

Past $\iota_0 + 6d$, whenever a non-faulty node considers *support* or *approve* messages that were received within the appropriate time intervals in Block L and Block M of the primitive it considers only messages from non-faulty nodes that were sent by non-faulty nodes as a result of executing the code of INITIATOR-ACCEPT.

Past ι_0 , if a non-faulty General G doesn't initiate INITIATOR-ACCEPT in an interval $[t, t + \Delta_{reset})$, where $t + \Delta_{reset} \leq \hat{t}$, by Claim 1 the lemma holds.

Now assume that the non-faulty node G did initiate INITIATOR-ACCEPT in the interval $[\iota_0, \iota_0 + \Delta_{reset})$. If during any such invocation (when executing INITIATOR-ACCEPT as one of the participating nodes) G fails to successfully execute either Line L4 within $2d$ of the invocation, or Line M4 within $3d$ of the invocation or Line N4 within $4d$ of the invocation, then it will not initiate the primitive for another Δ_{reset} , and by Claim 1 the lemma holds.

The only case that is left is when G did initiate INITIATOR-ACCEPT in the interval $[\iota_0, \iota_0 + \Delta_{reset}) = [\iota_0, \iota_0 + 20d + 4\Delta_{rmv})$ and whenever it does so, it successfully executes Line L4, Line M4, Line N4 within $2d$, $3d$, and $4d$, respectively. Recall that before initiating the primitive a non-faulty General removes all past messages associated with the primitive. Let $\bar{t} > \iota_0 + d$ be a time at which G invoked the primitive. Therefore, past time $\bar{t}$, all messages from non-faulty nodes that G receives, while executing the primitive,

were actually sent by non-faulty nodes. By assumption, by $\bar{t} + 2d$ G executes Line L4, therefore, by the code of the primitive, by $\bar{t} + 3d$ all non-faulty nodes would have $i_values[G, m]$ defined. Similarly, by $\bar{t} + 3d$ G execute Line M4, therefore by $\bar{t} + 4d$ all will have $ready_{G,m} = \text{'true'}$. Since all the $(ready, G, m)$ messages G accumulates were actually sent past $\bar{t} - d$ (it may receive these messages after invoking the primitive), all non-faulty nodes will receive at least $t + 1$ of them by $\bar{t} + 5d$, and by $\bar{t} + 6d$ all non-faulty nodes will successfully execute Line N4.

Let t' be the first time, past $\iota_0 + 20d + 4\Delta_{rmv}$, at which G , as a correct node invokes the primitive with some m , assuming it didn't do so with that specific m for at least $\Delta_v = 15d + 2\Delta_{rmv}$, and for any other m' for at least $\Delta_0 = 13d$. Let $\bar{t}$ be the last time G invoked the primitive with that specific m . By the arguments above, by $\bar{t} + 6d$ all non-faulty nodes would have set $last(G, m)$, and by $\bar{t} + 6d + 2\Delta_{rmv} + 9d \leq t'$ all would have reset it. For similar reasons, if t was the last time prior to t' at which G invoked the primitive with any value, then by $t + 6d$ all would have executed Line N4, and by $t + 6d + \Delta_0 - 6d = t + \Delta_0 < t'$ would have reset the variable $last_q(G)$. Therefore, when each correct node receives the invocation it will send $(support, G, m)$ within d of each other and by $t' + 4d$ all non-faulty nodes will execute Line N4, within $2d$ of each other.

To complete the proof we use mathematical induction as was done in the proof of [Claim 1](#). $\square$

[Lemma 1](#) and the validity criteria of initiating the primitive INITIATOR-ACCEPT imply the following.

Corollary 2. *Once the system is stable, whenever a correct General G initiates the INITIATOR-ACCEPT with some value m , the data structures at all correct nodes is fresh.*

We now prove some technical claims that cover the case of a faulty General.

Claim 2. *If a non-faulty node executes Line M2 (or Line M4) with some (G, m) at some time t , for $t > \iota_0 + 10d$, then no non-faulty node will execute Line M2 (or Line M4) with (G, m) at any t' , $t' \in (t + 10d, t + 2\Delta_{rmv})$ and in the interval $t' \in (t, t + 2\Delta_{rmv} + 10d)$ there is a sub-interval of length at least $2\Delta_{rmv}$ during which no non-faulty node executes Line M2 (or Line M4) with (G, m) .*

Proof. A non-faulty node that executed Line M2 (or Line M4) with (G, m) at time t has considered only messages sent past $\iota_0 + d$ and noticed at least one message from a non-faulty node, say q , that has sent $(approve, G, m)$ at some time in the interval $[t - 6d, t]$. The non-faulty node q sent the $(approve, G, m)$ message as a result of executing Line L4 at some time t' in the above interval. Since q have received $n - f$ $(support, G, m)$ messages in the interval $[t' - 2d, t']$, every non-faulty node should have noticed at least $t + 1$ of these in some interval $[t' - 3d, t' + d]$ and would have executed Line L2 in that interval. This implies that all non-faulty nodes have set $last(G, m)$ at some time in the interval $[t - 9d, t + d]$. By the protocol, no non-faulty node will send any $(support, G, m)$ later than $t + 2d$ (it allows for recent messages which causes it to send its support a d later) until it will reset $last(G, m)$, which takes $2\Delta_{rmv} + 9d$ time. The earliest this will happen to any non-faulty node is $t - 9d + 2\Delta_{rmv} + 9d = t + 2\Delta_{rmv}$.

Since no non-faulty node will send $(support, G, m)$ later than $t + 2d$, no non-faulty node will execute Line L4 later than $t + 2d + 2d = t + 4d$, and its message may be received by non-faulty nodes by $t + 5d$. Therefore, Line M2 (or M4) may still be executed as a result of such a message as late as $t + 10d$. This implies that no non-faulty node will execute Line M2 (or M4) in the interval $(t + 10d, t + 2\Delta_{rmv}]$. Note that by definition $2\Delta_{rmv} > 10d$.

Observe that the above arguments imply that if $\bar{t}$ is the latest time in the interval $[t, t + 10d]$ at which a non-faulty node executes Line M2, then no non-faulty node will execute Line M2 or Line M4 earlier than $\bar{t} + 2\Delta_{rmv}$, since each non-faulty node has set $last(G, m)$ at $\bar{t} - 9d$ or later. $\square$

Corollary 3. *If two non-faulty nodes execute Line M2 with (G, m) at some times t_1, t_2 , respectively, for $t_1, t_2 > \iota_0 + 10d$, then either $|t_1 - t_2| \leq 9d$ or $|t_1 - t_2| > 2\Delta_{rmv}$.*

Claim 3. *If a non-faulty node executes Line M4 with (G, m) at some time t , for $t > \iota_0 + 10d$, then no non-faulty node will execute Line M4 in the interval $[t + 8d, t + 2\Delta_{rmv} + 5d]$; and in the interval $[t, t + 2\Delta_{rmv} + 6d]$, there is sub-interval of length $2\Delta_{rmv}$ during which no non-faulty node executes either Line M2 or Line M4 with (G, m) .*

Proof. A non-faulty node that executed Line M4 with (G, m) at time t has considered only messages sent past $\iota_0 + d$ and noticed at least $t + 1$ message from non-faulty nodes that were sent in the interval $[t - 4d, t]$. Each such message is a result of receiving $(support, G, m)$ messages that may have been sent as early as $t - 7d$. Thus, all these are based on actual messages being sent past $\iota_0 + d$.

Let t be a time at which a non-faulty node execute Line M4 with (G, m) . By $t + d$ all non-faulty nodes will set $last(G, m)$. Past $t + 2d$ and until its $last(G, m)$ is reset no non-faulty node will send $(support, G, m)$. Therefore, no non-faulty node will send $(approve, G, m)$ past $t + 2d + 2d$, and none will execute Line M4 past $t + 4d + d + 3d$ and until its $last(G, m)$ is reset. Since a non-faulty node executed Line M4 at time t , the set of messages causing it to execute Line M4 should cause all other non-faulty node to execute Line M2 at some time past $t - 4d$. Thus, this is the earliest time at which some non-faulty node may have set $last(G, m)$ and will not set it later. Therefore, no non-faulty node will execute Line M4 in the interval $[t + 8d, t + 2\Delta_{rmv} + 5d]$.

Observe that the above arguments imply that if $\bar{t}$ is the latest time the interval $[t - 4d, t + 8d]$ at which a non-faulty node executes Line M4, then no non-faulty node will execute Line M2 or Line M4 with (G, m) earlier than $\bar{t} + 2\Delta_{rmv} + 5d$. $\square$

Claim 3 implies the following.

Corollary 4. *If two non-faulty nodes execute Line M4 with (G, m) at some time t_1, t_2 , respectively, for $t_1, t_2 > \iota_0 + 10d$, then either $|t_1 - t_2| \leq 7d$ or $|t_1 - t_2| > 2\Delta_{rmv}$.*

Claim 4. *If no non-faulty node executes Line M2 (or Line M4) with (G, m) in an interval $(t, t + 2\Delta_{rmv}]$, for $t > \iota_0 + \Delta_{rmv}$, then no non-faulty node will execute Line N2 or Line N4 with (G, m) in the interval $[t + \Delta_{rmv}, t'']$, where $t + 2\Delta_{rmv} < t''$ and some non-faulty node executes Line M4 with (G, m) at time t'' .*

Proof. Because $t > \iota_0 + \Delta_{rmv}$, all non-faulty nodes have decayed all messages that appeared as part of the initial state that may have not been actually sent. Since we assume that no non-faulty node executes Line M2 with (G, m) in the interval $(t, t + 2\Delta_{rmv}]$, by $t + \Delta_{rmv}$ all will have reset $ready_{G,m}$ and will not execute Line N2 or Line N4 any more, so no non-faulty node will send a new $ready$ message. By $t + 2\Delta_{rmv}$, all will decay all previous $(ready, G, m)$ messages that were sent by non-faulty nodes. From that time on, even if some non-faulty nodes will execute Line M2, none will be able to execute Line N2 until a new $(ready, G, m)$ message is produced by a non-faulty node, thus until some non-faulty node execute Line M4 with (G, m) . $\square$

The proof makes use of the following simple observation.

Claim 5. *At any time t , $t > \iota + \Delta_{rmv}$, if a non-faulty node sets $i_values[G, m]$, then some non-faulty node has sent $(support, G, m)$ later than $rt(i_values[G, m])$.*

Proof. If the node did it in Line K2, then it trivially holds. Otherwise, the time window considered in Line L2 includes a sending event of a correct node, and that happened at the earliest d time units before the time window span. $\square$

Using the above claims we can now prove the following.

Lemma 2. *Once the system is stable, if any correct node, say q , executes Line N4 with (G, m) , at some time $\bar{t}$, where $\bar{t} - rt(\tau_q^G) \leq \Delta_{rmv} - 9d$, then*

1. *all correct nodes will execute Line N4 with (G, m) within $2d$ of each other in the interval $[\bar{t} - 2d, \bar{t} + 2d]$;*
2. *for any correct node p , $|rt(\tau_q^G) - rt(\tau_p^G)| \leq 6d$;*
3. *some correct node executed Line M4 later than $\bar{t} - \Delta_{rmv} + 7d$*

Proof. Let q be such a correct node. By the condition in Line N3, $ready_{G,m}$ was last set by q while executing Line M2 at some time t' , later than $\bar{t} - \Delta_{rmv}$. Consider the interval $(\iota_0 + \Delta_{rmv}, \bar{t} - \Delta_{rmv} - 9d)$. By the definition of stability it is longer than $4\Delta_{rmv}$. If no correct node executed Line M4 (with G, m) in this interval, since the system is stable, then the preconditions of Claim 4 hold.

Otherwise, let t_1 be the latest time in the above interval at which a correct node executed Line M4. By definition $|t' - t_1| > 9d$. Therefore, by Corollary 4 and Corollary 3, $|t' - t_1| > 2\Delta_{rmv}$ and this holds for any other correct node that executed Line M4 or Line M2 within $9d$ of q , i.e., within $9d$ of t' . Therefore, again, the preconditions of Claim 4 hold.

By Claim 5, some correct node have sent $(support, G, m)$ in the interval $[rt(\tau_q^G), \bar{t}]$. By the code of the primitive, it would have not done so if any correct node would have executed Line M2 or Line M4 in the interval $[\bar{t} - \Delta_{rmv}, rt(\tau_q^G) - 2d]$, since it would have set its $last(G, m)$ at least d prior to that sending.

This implies that $t' \geq rt(\tau_q^G) - 2d$, and that any correct node executing Line M2 or Line M4 within $9d$ of t' should do so later than t_2 , where $t_2 = rt(\tau_q^G) - 2d \geq \bar{t} - \Delta_{rmv} + 7d$.

By Claim 4, some correct node executed Line M4, in the interval $[\bar{t} - \Delta_{rmv} - 9d, \bar{t}]$. Since it should be within $9d$ of t' , by the above argument, that should happen at some time t_3 in the interval $[t_2, \bar{t}]$. Proving the third item of the claim. By the code of the primitive, every correct node should execute Line M2 in the interval $[t_3 - 5d, t_3 + d]$. This implies that they should do so in the interval $[t_2, \bar{t} + d]$, which implies within the interval $I = [\bar{t} - \Delta_{rmv} + 7d, \bar{t} + d]$.

The correct node q executed Line N4 at time $\bar{t}$. It has received at least $t + 1$ $(ready, G, m)$ messages from correct nodes. Any correct node sending such a message should have executed Line M2 prior to sending the message; and such a message is a result of executing either Line M4 or Line N2. By Claim 4 that can happen either before time $t_1 + \Delta_{rmv}$ or later than time t_2 . If it would be earlier than $t_1 + \Delta_{rmv}$, node q would have decayed that message from its memory since we already argued that $|t' - t_1| > 2\Delta_{rmv}$.

We conclude that all such messages from correct nodes were sent past time t_2 . Therefore, by $\bar{t} + d$ each correct node would execute Line N2, since its pre-conditions holds, and by $\bar{t} + 2d$ all will execute

Line N4. Let q' be the first correct node to execute Line N4 past time t_2 . The above arguments imply that it has done so in the interval $[\bar{t} - 2d, \bar{t} + 2d]$, and that all correct nodes would have executed Line N4 within $2d$ of q' . Proving the first item of the claim.

From the above discussion, some correct node q'' executed Line M4 in the interval $[\bar{t} - \Delta_{rmv} + 6d, \bar{t}]$. Denote that time by t'' . Node q'' collected $n - f$ *approve* messages in the interval $[t'' - 3d, t'']$. At least one of which is from a correct node. Let q' be that node and let t' be the time it sent its *approve* message. From the above discussion, $t' \in [\bar{t} - \Delta_{rmv} + 6d - 3d - d, \bar{t}] = [\bar{t} - \Delta_{rmv} + 2d, \bar{t}]$. Node q' collected $n - f$ *support* messages, with at least $n - 2f$ from correct nodes. Let t_1 be the time at which the $(n - 2f)^{th}$ *support* message sent by a correct node was received by q' . Since q' executed Line L4, all these messages should have been received in the interval $[t_1 - 2d, t_1]$. Node q' should have set a recording time τ , $rt(\tau) \geq t_1 - 4d$, as a result of (maybe repeating) the execution of Line L2.

Every other correct node should have received the $(n - 2f)^{th}$ *support* message sent by a correct node at some time in the interval $[t_1 - d, t_1 + d]$ with the set of $(n - 2f)$ *support* messages sent by correct nodes being received in the interval $[t_1 - 3d, t_1 + d]$. Each such correct node should have set the recording time after (maybe repeatedly) executing Line L2, since this window satisfies the precondition of Line L1. Thus, eventually all recording times are $\geq t_1 - 5d$. Observe that since this interval is short, none of these messages would have been decayed by the time they are processed by the correct nodes.

Some correct node may send a *support* message, by executing Line K2, at most d time units after receiving these $n - 2f$ messages. This can not take place later than $t_1 + 2d$, resulting in a recording time of $t_1 + d$, though earlier than its time of sending the *support* message. This *support* message (with the possible help of faulty nodes) can cause some correct node to execute Line L2 at some later time. The window within which the *support* messages at that node are collected should include the real-time $t_1 + 3d$, the latest time any *support* from any correct node could have been received. Any such execution will result in a recording time that is $\leq t_1 + 3d - 2d = t_1 + d$. Thus the range of recording times for all correct nodes (including q) are $[t_1 - 5d, t_1 + d]$.

To complete the proof of the second item we need to show that each correct node, p , actually sets its τ_p^G . By assumption, $\bar{t} - rt(\tau_q^G) \leq \Delta_{rmv} - 9d$, therefore $rt(\tau_q^G) \geq \bar{t} - \Delta_{rmv} + 9d$. This implies that $t_1 + d \geq \bar{t} - \Delta_{rmv} + 9d$. Implying that $t_1 - 5d \geq \bar{t} - \Delta_{rmv} + 3d$. Therefore, when each correct node executes Line N4, its τ^G is well defined, since the $i_values[G, m]$ entry wasn't decayed yet. Thus, completing the proof. $\square$

We are now ready to prove the properties of the primitive INITIATOR-ACCEPT.

Theorem 1. *Once the system is stable, the primitive INITIATOR-ACCEPT presented in Figure 2 satisfies properties [IA-1] through [IA-4].*

Proof.

Correctness: Corollary 2 proves that when a correct General initiates the primitive, the data-structures at correct nodes are fresh. Assume that within d of each other all correct nodes invoke INITIATOR-ACCEPT (G, m) . Let t_1 be the real-time at which the General invokes its copy of the INITIATOR-ACCEPT then by t_2 , $t_2 \leq t_1 + d$, the last correct node did so. Since all data structures are *fresh*, then no value $\{G, m'\}$ appeared in $i_values[G, *]$ d time units before that, thus Line K1 will hold for all correct nodes. Therefore, every correct node sends $(support, G, m)$. Each such message reaches all other correct nodes within d . Thus, between t_1 and $t_2 + d$ every correct node receives $(support, G, m)$ from $n - f$ distinct nodes and

sends $(approve, G, m)$. By $t_2 + 2d$ every correct node sends $(ready, G, m)$, and by $t_2 + 3d$ I-accepts $\langle G, m, \tau' \rangle$, for some τ' , thus, proving [IA-1A].

To prove [IA-1B], let q be the first to I-accept after executing Line M4. Within d all correct nodes will execute Line M2, and within $2d$ all will I-accept.

Note that for every pair of correct nodes q and q' , the associated initial recording times τ and τ' satisfy $|\tau - \tau'| \leq d$. Line K2 implies that the recording times of correct nodes can not be earlier than $t_1 - d$. Some correct node may see $n - 2f$, with the help of faulty nodes as late as $t_2 + 2d$. All such windows should contain a *support* from a correct node, so should include real-time $t_2 + d$, resulting in a recording time of $t_2 - d$. Recall that $t_2 \leq t_1 + d$, proving [IA-1C].

To prove [IA-1D] notice that the fastest node may set τ' to be $t_1 - d$, but may I-accept only by $t_2 + 3d \leq t_1 + 4d$.

Unforgeability:

If no correct node invokes INITIATOR-ACCEPT and will not send $(support, G, m)$, then no correct node will ever execute L4 and will not send $(ready, G, m)$. Thus, no correct node can accumulate $n - f$ distinct $(ready, G, m)$ messages and therefore will not I-accept $\langle G, m \rangle$. Moreover, no correct will execute lines K2 or L2, and therefore if G is correct, no correct node will invoke INITIATOR-ACCEPT, and no correct will have any entry in the Initiator's data structure.

Δ_{agr} -Relay:

Let q be a correct node that I-accepts $\langle G, m, \tau_q^G \rangle$ at real-time t , such that $0 \leq t - rt(\tau_q^G) \leq \Delta_{agr}$. It did so as a result of executing Line N4. By assumption the preconditions of Lemma 2 hold, and therefore all correct nodes will I-accept $\langle G, m, \tau_q \rangle$ within $2d$ of each other, in the interval $[t - 2d, t + 2d]$, with τ^G values that are $6d$ apart. Thus, proving [IA-3A].

To prove [IA-3B] notice that any range of messages considered in Line L2 includes a *support* of a correct node. The resulting recording time will never be later than the sending time of the *support* message by that correct node, and thus by some correct node.

The first part of [IA-3C] is immediate from Line L2 and Line K2. For the second part observe that for every other correct node q' , $rt(\tau_{q'}) \leq rt(\tau_q) + 2d$ and $rt(\tau_{q'}^G) \geq rt(\tau_q^G) - 6d$. Thus, $rt(\tau_{q'}) - rt(\tau_{q'}^G) \leq rt(\tau_q) - rt(\tau_q^G) + 8d \leq \Delta_{agr} + 8d$.

Uniqueness:

To prove [IA-4] observe that the conditions in Line K1 implies that each non-faulty node sends a *support* for a single m at a time. In order to I-accept, a correct node needs to send *approve* after receiving $n - f$ *support* messages. That can happen for at most a single value of m , because $n > 3f$.

By Lemma 2, once a correct node execute Line N4, all do it within $2d$. By the protocol, once a node decides it removes accepted messages and ignores new message associated with (G, m) for $3d$. Therefore, all correct nodes issue I-accept, and stop sending messages associated with (G, m) before a correct one agrees to consider such messages. So past messages cannot be used again to reproduce another wave of decisions, unless a new correct node sends a new support for (G, m) .

Previously sent messages for another value of m will not produce a wave of decisions unless a new correct node will send $(support, G, m)$ for such a value. None will send support for a new value for

$\Delta_0 - 6d > 6d$, so by the time such a message will be sent, old values will be out of any window of consideration for executing any L or M lines of the code by a any correct node. Line N cannot be executed unless some correct node excuses Line M4.

What is left to prove, is that future invocations of the primitive will not violate [IA-4].

Again, by Lemma 2, once a correct node execute Line N4, all do it within $2d$. Let q be the first to excute Line N4 in the current execution, and let it be at time $rt(\tau_p) = t'$. By $t' + d$ all non-faulty would execute Line L2, and the latest any correct will execute Line K2 is $t' + d$. By inspecting the possible scenarios one can see that no non-faulty will execute Line L2 later than $t' + 5d$, and the latest value set by any correct node in that interval will never be later than $t' + d$. Thus, for every correct node q , $rt(\tau_q^G) \leq rt(\tau_p) + d$.

The earliest time at which any correct node will send $(support, G, m)$ later than that time will be at $rt(\tau_p) + \Delta_0 - 6d$. By inspecting the protocol, the earliest possible setting of value in Line K2 will be to $rt(\tau_p) + \Delta_0 - 6d - 2d$. Therefore, if we denote by τ timings in the former invocation and by $\bar{\tau}$ timings in the later one, we conclude that for any two correct nodes p and q , $rt(\bar{\tau}_q^G) - rt(\tau_p^G) \geq \Delta_0 - 9d = 4d$. $\square$

We can now state the concluding corollary.

Corollary 5. *The system converge from any initial state within $2 \times \Delta_{reset} = d$, provided that there are $n - t$ non-faulty nodes that are continuously non-faulty during that period.*

Proof. Since all properties hold once the system is stable, and stability is defined as $2 \times \Delta_{reset}$ form the time the network is correct, we conclude the proof. $\square$

One can reduce the requirement of having the same non-faulty nodes stay continuously so, but we do not see this optimization as an important issue. Moreover, the proofs above shows that once a non-faulty node discards old values it can be considered correct. Therefore we can state the following corollary.

Corollary 6. *Once the system is stable, a non-faulty node that is non-faulty for Δ_{node} time, can be considered correct.*

6.2 Proof of the MSGD-BROADCAST Properties

The proofs essentially follow the arguments in the original paper [14].

Lemma 3. *If a correct node p_i sends a message at local-time τ_i , $\tau_i \leq \tau_i^G + r \cdot \Phi$ on p_i 's timer it will be received and processed by each correct node p_j at some local-time τ_j , $\tau_j \leq \tau_j^G + (r+1) \cdot \Phi$, on p_j 's timer.*

Proof. Assume that node p_i sends a message at real-time t with local-time $\tau_i \leq \tau_i^G + r \cdot \Phi$. Thus, $\tau_i \leq \tau_i^G + r(t_{skew}^G + 2d)$. It should arrive at any correct node p_j within d . By IA-3A, τ_j^G will be defined and the message will be processed no later than by another d . By IA-3A, $|rt(\tau_i^G) - rt(\tau_j^G)| < t_{skew}^G$. Thus, $rt(\tau_i^G) \leq rt(\tau_j^G) + t_{skew}^G$, and at time $rt(\tau_j)$, by which the message arrived and processed at p_j , we get

$$rt(\tau_j) \leq rt(\tau_i) + 2d \leq rt(\tau_i^G) + r(t_{skew}^G + 2d) + 2d,$$

and therefore

$$rt(\tau_j) \leq rt(\tau_j^G) + t_{skew}^G + r(t_{skew}^G + 2d) + 2d \leq rt(\tau_j^G) + (r+1) \cdot \Phi.$$

$\square$

Lemma 4. *If a correct node ever sends $(echo', p, m, k)$ then at least one correct node, say q' , must have sent $(echo', p, m, k)$ at some local-time $\tau_{q'}$, $\tau_{q'} \leq \tau_q^G + (2k + 2) \cdot \Phi$.*

Proof. Let t be the earliest real-time by which any correct node q sends the message $(echo', p, m, k)$. If $t > rt(\tau_q^G) + (2k + 2) \cdot \Phi$, node q should have received $(echo', p, m, k)$ from $n - 2f$ distinct nodes, at least one of which from a correct node, say q' , that was sent prior to local local-time $\tau_{q'}^G + (2k + 2) \cdot \Phi$. $\square$

Lemma 5. *If a correct node ever sends $(echo', p, m, k)$ then p 's message $(init, p, m, k)$ must have been received by at least one correct node, say q' , at some time $\tau_{q'}$, $\tau_{q'} \leq \tau_{q'}^G + 2k \cdot \Phi$.*

Proof. By Lemma 4, if a correct node ever sends $(echo', p, m, k)$, then some correct node q should send it at local-time τ_q , $\tau_q \leq \tau_q^G + (2k + 2) \cdot \Phi$. By the primitive MSGD-BROADCAST, q have received $(init', p, m, k)$ from at least $n - f$ nodes by some local-time τ_q , $\tau_q \leq \tau_q^G + (2k + 2) \cdot \Phi$. At least one of them is a correct node q'' who have received $n - 2f$ $(echo, p, m, k)$ at some local-time $\tau_{q''}$, $\tau_{q''} \leq \tau_{q''}^G + (2k + 1) \cdot \Phi$. One of which was sent by a correct node $\bar{q}$ that should have received $(init, p, m, k)$ before sending $(echo, p, m, k)$ at some local-time $\tau_{\bar{q}}$, $\tau_{\bar{q}} \leq \tau_{\bar{q}}^G + 2k \cdot \Phi$. $\square$

Lemma 6. *If a correct node p invokes the primitive MSGD-BROADCAST (p, m, k) at real-time t_p , then each correct node q accepts (p, m, k) at some real-time t_q , such that $|t_p - t_q| \leq 3d$.*

Proof. The *init* message of p sent in Line V will arrive to every node by $t_p + d$. By 1A-3A, by $t_p + 2d$ all will have their τ^G defined and will process the *init* message. By Lemma 3, all will execute Line W3 by that time. By $t_p + 3d$ all will execute Line X5 and will accept. $\square$

Theorem 2. *The MSGD-BROADCAST primitive presented in Figure 3 satisfies properties [TSP-1] through [TSP-4].*

Proof. Correctness: Assume that a correct node p MSGD-BROADCASTS (p, m, k) at τ_p , $\tau_p \leq \tau_p^G + (2k - 1) \cdot \Phi$, on its timer. Any correct node, say q , receives $(init, p, m, k)$ and sends $(echo, p, m, k)$ at some τ_q , $\tau_q \leq \tau_q^G + 2k \cdot \Phi$ on its timer. Thus, any correct node, say $\bar{q}$ receives $n - f$ $(echo, p, m, k)$ from distinct nodes at some $\tau_{\bar{q}}$, $\tau_{\bar{q}} \leq \tau_{\bar{q}}^G + (2k + 1) \cdot \Phi$, on its timer and accepts (p, m, k) . The second part of the correctness is a result of Lemma 6.

Unforgeability: If a correct node p does not broadcast (p, m, k) , it does not send $(init, p, m, k)$, and no correct node will send $(echo, p, m, k)$ at some τ , $\tau \leq \tau^G + 2k \cdot \Phi$, on its timer. Thus, no correct node accepts (p, m, k) by $\tau^G + (2k + 1) \cdot \Phi$ on its timer. If a correct node would have accepted (p, m, k) at a later time it can be only as a result of receiving $n - f$ $(echo', p, m, k)$ distinct messages, some of which must be from correct nodes. By Lemma 5, p should have sent $(init, p, m, k)$, a contradiction.

Relay: The delicate point is when a correct node issues an accept as a result of getting echo messages. So assume that q_1 accepts (p, m, k) at $t_1 = rt(\tau_1)$ as a result of executing Line X5. By that time it must have received $(echo, p, m, k)$ from $n - f$ nodes, at least $n - 2f$ of them sent by correct nodes. Since every correct node among these has sent its message by $\tau^G + 2k \cdot \Phi$ on its timer, by Lemma 3, all those messages should have arrived to every correct node q_i by $\tau_i \leq \tau_i^G + (2k + 1) \cdot \Phi$ on its timer. Thus, every correct node q_i should have sent $(init', p, m, k)$ at some τ_i , $\tau_i \leq \tau_i^G + (2k + 1) \cdot \Phi$, on its timer. As a result, every correct node will receive $n - f$ such messages by some $\bar{\tau}$, $\bar{\tau} \leq \tau^G + (2k + 2) \cdot \Phi$ on its timer and will send $(echo', p, m, k)$ at that time, which will lead each correct node to accept (p, m, k) at a local-time τ_i .

Now observe that all $n - 2f$ ($echo, p, m, k$) were sent before time t_1 . By $t_1 + d$ they arrive to all correct nodes. By $t_1 + 2d$ all will have their τ^G defined and will process them. By $t_1 + 3d$ their ($init', p, m, k$) will arrive to all correct nodes, which will lead all correct nodes to send ($echo', p, m, k$). Thus, all correct nodes will accept (p, m, k) at time $\tau_i \leq t_1 + 4d$.

By assumption, $t_1 = rt(\tau_1) \leq rt(\tau_1^G) + r \cdot \Phi$. By IA-3A, $rt(\tau_1^G) \leq rt(\tau_i^G) + t_{skew}^G$. Therefore we conclude: $rt(\tau_i) \leq rt(\tau_1) + 4d \leq rt(\tau_1^G) + r \cdot \Phi + 4d \leq rt(\tau_i^G) + t_{skew}^G + r \cdot \Phi + 4d \leq rt(\tau_i^G) + (r + 2) \cdot \Phi$.

The case that the accept is a result of executing Line Z5 is a special case of the above arguments.

Detection of broadcasters: As in the original proof ([14]), we first argue the second part. Assume that a correct node q adds node p to *broadcasters*. It should have received $n - 2f$ ($init', p, m, k$) messages. Thus, at least one correct node has sent ($init', p, m, k$) as a result of receiving $n - 2f$ ($echo, p, m, k$) messages. One of these should be from a correct node that has received the original broadcast message of p .

To prove the first part, we consider two similar cases to support the Relay property. If $r = k$ and the correct node, say q , accepts (p, m, k) as a result of receiving ($echo, p, m, k$) from $n - f$ nodes by some τ_q , $\tau_q \leq \tau_q^G + (2k + 1) \cdot \Phi$, on its timer. At least $n - 2f$ of them were sent by correct nodes. Since each correct node among these has sent its message at some τ , $\tau \leq \tau^G + 2k \cdot \Phi$, by Lemma 3, all those messages should have arrived to any correct node, say q_i , by some τ_i , $\tau_i \leq \tau_i^G + (2k + 1) \cdot \Phi$ on its timer. Thus, each correct node, say q_j should have sent ($init', p, m, k$) at some τ_j , $\tau_j \leq \tau_j^G + (2k + 1) \cdot \Phi$, on its timer. As a result, by Lemma 3, each correct node, say q' , will receive $n - f$ such messages by some $\tau_{q'}$, $\tau_{q'} \leq \tau_{q'}^G + (2k + 2) \cdot \Phi$ on its timer and will add p to *broadcasters*.

Otherwise, q accepts (p, m, k) as a result of receiving from $n - f$ nodes ($echo', p, m, k$) by some τ_q on its timer. By Lemma 4 a correct node, say q_i , sent ($echo', p, m, k$) at some τ_i , $\tau_i \leq \tau_i^G + (2k + 2) \cdot \Phi$. It should have received $n - f$ ($init', p, m, k$) messages by that time. All such messages that were sent by correct nodes were sent at some τ , $\tau \leq \tau^G + (2k + 1) \cdot \Phi$, on their timers and should arrive at each node q_j , at some τ_j , $\tau_j \leq \tau_j^G + (2k + 2) \cdot \Phi$, on its timer. Since there are at least $n - 2f$ such messages, all will add p to *broadcasters* at some τ , $\tau \leq \tau^G + (2k + 2) \cdot \Phi$, on their timers. □

6.3 Proof of the SS-BYZ-AGREE Properties

Theorem 3. (Convergence) *Once the system is stable, any invocation of SS-BYZ-AGREE presented in Figure 1 satisfies the Termination property. When $n > 3f$, it also satisfies the Agreement and Validity properties.*

Proof. Notice that the General G itself is one of the nodes, so if it is faulty then there are only $f - 1$ potentially faulty nodes. We do not use that fact in the proof since the version of SS-BYZ-AGREE presented does not refer explicitly to the General. One can adapt the proof and reduce Δ_{agr} by $2 \cdot \Phi$ when specifically handling that case.

By Corollary 2, by the time the system becomes stable, all data structures are fresh.

We begin by proving Validity.

Validity: Since all the correct nodes invoke the primitive SS-BYZ-AGREE as a result of a value sent by a correct G , they will all invoke INITIATOR-ACCEPT within d of each other with fresh data structure,

hence [IA-1] implies that they all will execute Block R within $2d$ of each other, and Validity holds.

The rest of the proof makes use of the following two lemmata.

Lemma 7. *If a correct node p aborts at local-time τ_p , $\tau_p > \tau_p^G + (2r+1) \cdot \Phi$, on its timer, then no correct node q decides at a time τ_q , $\tau_q \geq \tau_q^G + (2r+1) \cdot \Phi$, on its timer.*

Proof. Let p be a correct node that aborts at time τ_p , $\tau_p > \tau_p^G + (2r+1) \cdot \Phi$. In this case it should have identified at most $r-2$ broadcasters by that time. By the detection of the broadcasters property [TPS-4], no correct node will ever accept $\langle G, m' \rangle$ and $r-1$ distinct messages (q_i, m', i) for $1 \leq i \leq r-1$, since that would have caused each correct node, including p , to hold $r-1$ broadcasters by some time τ , $\tau \leq \tau^G + (2(r-1)+2) \cdot \Phi$ on its timer. Thus, no correct node, say q , can decide at a time $\tau_q \geq \tau_q^G + (2r+1) \cdot \Phi$ on its timer. $\square$

Lemma 8. *If a correct node p decides at time τ_p , $\tau_p \leq \tau_p^G + (2r+1) \cdot \Phi$, on its timer, then each correct node, say q , decides by some time τ_q , $\tau_q \leq \tau_q^G + (2r+3) \cdot \Phi$ on its timer.*

Proof. Let p be a correct node that decides at local-time τ_p , $\tau_p \leq \tau_p^G + (2r+1) \cdot \Phi$. We consider the following cases:

1. $r = 0$: No correct node can abort by a time τ , $\tau \leq \tau^G + (2r+1) \cdot \Phi$, since the inequality will not hold. Assume that node p have accepted $\langle G, m' \rangle$ by $\tau_p \leq \tau_p^G + 4d \leq \tau_p^G + \Phi$. By the relay property [TPS-3] each correct node will accept $\langle G, m' \rangle$ by some time τ , $\tau \leq \tau^G + 3 \cdot \Phi$ on its timer. Moreover, p invokes $\text{MSGD-BROADCAST}(p, m', 1)$, by the Correctness property [TPS-1] it will be accepted by each correct node by time τ , $\tau \leq \tau^G + 3 \cdot \Phi$, on its timer. Thus, all correct nodes will have *value* $\neq \perp$ and will broadcast and stop by time $\tau^G + 3 \cdot \Phi$ on their timers, when executing Block S.
2. $1 \leq r \leq f-1$: Node p must have accepted $\langle G, m' \rangle$ and also accepted r distinct (q_i, m', i) messages for all i , $2 \leq i \leq r$, by time τ , $\tau \leq \tau^G + (2r+1) \cdot \Phi$, on its timer. By Lemma 7, no correct node aborts by that time. By Relay property [TPS-3] each (q_i, m', i) message will be accepted by each correct node by some time τ , $\tau \leq \tau^G + (2r+3) \cdot \Phi$, on its timer. Node p broadcasts $(p, m', r+1)$ before stopping. By the Correctness property, [TPS-1], this message will be accepted by every correct node at some time τ , $\tau \leq \tau^G + (2r+3) \cdot \Phi$, on its timer. Thus, no correct node will abort by time τ , $\tau \leq \tau^G + (2r+3) \cdot \Phi$, and all correct nodes will have *value* $\neq \perp$ and will thus decide by that time.
3. $r = f$: Node p must have accepted a (q_i, m', i) message for all i , $1 \leq i \leq f-1$, by τ_p , $\tau_p \leq \tau_p^G + (2f+1) \cdot \Phi$, on its timer, where the f q_i 's are distinct. If the General G is correct, then by Validity the claim holds. Otherwise, at least one of these f nodes (which all differ from G), say q_j , must be correct. By the Unforgeability property [TPS-2], node q_j invoked $\text{MSGD-BROADCAST}(q_j, m', j)$ by some local-time τ , $\tau \leq \tau^G + (2j+1) \cdot \Phi$ and decided. Since $j \leq f$ the above arguments imply that by some local-time τ , $\tau \leq \tau^G + (2f+1) \cdot \Phi$, each correct node will decide. $\square$

Lemma 8 implies that if a correct node decides at time τ , $\tau \leq \tau^G + (2r + 1) \cdot \Phi$, on its timer, then no correct node p aborts at time τ_p , $\tau_p > \tau_p^G + (2r + 1) \cdot \Phi$. **Lemma 7** implies the other direction.

Termination: Each correct node either terminates the protocol by returning a value, or by time $(2f + 1) \cdot \Phi + 3d$ on its clock all entries will be reset, which is a termination of the protocol.

Agreement: If no correct node decides, then all correct nodes that execute the protocol abort, and return a $\perp$ value. Otherwise, let q be the first correct node to decide. Therefore, no correct node aborts. The value returned by q is the value m' of the accepted $(p, m', 1)$ message. By [IA-4] if any correct node I-accepts, all correct nodes I-accept with a single value. Thus all correct nodes return the same value.

Timeliness:

1. (agreement) For every two correct nodes q and q' that decide on (G, m) at τ_q and $\tau_{q'}$, respectively:
 - (a) If validity hold, then $|rt(\tau_q) - rt(\tau_{q'})| \leq 2d$, by [IA-3A]; Otherwise, $|rt(\tau_q) - rt(\tau_{q'})| \leq 3d$, by [TPS-1].
 - (b) $|rt(\tau_q^G) - rt(\tau_{q'}^G)| \leq 6d$ by [IA-3A].
 - (c) $rt(\tau_q^G), rt(\tau_{q'}^G) \in [t_1 - 2d, t_2]$ by [IA-3B].
 - (d) $rt(\tau_r^G) \leq rt(\tau_r)$, by [IA-3C], and if the inequality $rt(\tau_r) - rt(\tau_r^G) \leq \Delta_{agr}$ would not hold, the node would abort right away.
2. (validity) If all correct nodes invoked the protocol in an interval $[t_0, t_0 + d]$, as a result of (Initiator, G, m) sent by a correct G that spaced the sending by $6d$ from its last agreement, then for every correct node q that may have decided $3d$ later than G , the new invocation will still happen with fresh data structures, since they are reset $3d$ after decision. By that time it already reset the data structures (including *latest_accept*) of the last execution, and the new decision time τ_q , satisfies $t_0 - d \leq rt(\tau_q^G) \leq rt(\tau_q) \leq t_0 + 4d$ as implied by [IA-1D].
3. (separation) By [IA-4] the real-times of the I-accepts satisfy the requirements. Since a node will not reset its data structures before terminating the protocol, it will not send a *support* before completing the previous protocol execution. Therefore, the protocol itself can only increase the time difference between agreements. Thus, the minimal difference is achieved when a decision takes place right after the termination of the primitive INITIATOR-ACCEPT.

□

Acknowledgements

We wish to thank Ittai Abraham and Ezra Hoch for discussing some of the fine points of the model and the proofs. This research was supported in part by grants from ISF, NSF, CCR, and AFOSR.

References

- [1] J. Beauquier, S. Kekkonen-Moneta, "*Fault-tolerance and Self-stabilization: Impossibility Results and Solutions Using Failure Detectors*", Int. J of Systems Science, Vol. 28(11) pp. 1177-1187, 1997.
- [2] B. Coan, D. Dolev, C. Dwork and L. Stockmeyer, "*The distributed firing squad problem*", Proc. of the 7th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing, pp. 335-345, Providence, Rhode Island, May 1985.
- [3] A. Daliot, D. Dolev and H. Parnas, "*Self-stabilizing Pulse Synchronization Inspired by Biological Pacemaker Networks*", Proc. of the 6th Symposium on Self-Stabilizing Systems (SSS'03 San-Francisco), pp. 32-48, 2003.
- [4] A. Daliot and D. Dolev, "*Self-stabilization of Byzantine Protocols*", Proc. of the 7th Symposium on Self-Stabilizing Systems (SSS'05 Barcelona), pp. 48-67, 2005.
- [5] A. Daliot, D. Dolev and H. Parnas, "*Linear Time Byzantine Self-Stabilizing Clock Synchronization*", Proc. of 7th Int. Conference on Principles of Distributed Systems (OPODIS'03 La Martinique), France, Dec. 2003.
- [6] A. Daliot and D. Dolev, "*Making Order in Chaos: Self-stabilizing Byzantine Pulse Synchronization*", unpublished manuscript July 2006.
- [7] A. Daliot and D. Dolev, "*Self-stabilizing byzantine agreement*", Proc. of the Twenty-fifth ACM Symposium on Principles of Distributed Computing (PODC'06), Denver, Colorado, Jul 2006.
- [8] S. Dolev, and J. L. Welch, "*Self-Stabilizing Clock Synchronization in the presence of Byzantine faults*", Journal of the ACM, Vol. 51, Issue 5, pp. 780 - 799, 2004.
- [9] D. Dolev and E. N. Hoch, "*On self-stabilizing synchronous actions despite byzantine attacks*", In Proc. the 21st Int. Symposium on Distributed Computing (DISC'07), Lemesos, Cyprus, Sep. 2007.
- [10] D. Dolev, H. R. Strong, "*Polynomial Algorithms for Multiple Processor Agreement*", In Proceedings, the 14th ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC-82), pp. 401-407, May 1982.
- [11] P. Dutta, R. Guerraoui, L. Lamport, "*How Fast Can Eventual Synchrony Lead to Consensus?*", Proc. of the 2005 Int. Conf. on Dependable Systems and Networks (DSN'05 Yokohama), Japan, June 2005.
- [12] L. Lamport, R. Shostak, M. Pease, "*The Byzantine Generals Problem*", ACM Transactions on Programming Languages and Systems, 4(3):382-301, 1982.
- [13] M. Pease, R. Shostak, L. Lamport, "*Reaching Agreement in the Presence of Faults*", Journal of the ACM, Vol. 27, No. 2. pp. 228-234, Apr. 1980.
- [14] S. Toueg, K. J. Perry, T. K. Srikanth, "*Fast Distributed Agreement*", SIAM Journal on Computing, 16(3):445-457, June 1987.
- [15] J. Widder, "*Booting clock synchronization in partially synchronous systems*", In Proc. the 17th Int. Symposium on Distributed Computing (DISC'03 Sorrento), Oct. 2003.